

A SECOND ^{105-a} ² ³²
R E P L Y

T O

Doctor *ALLIX*.

WITH
Two POSTSCRIPTS:

The FIRST

To Mr. *CHISHULL*;

The SECOND

To the Author of the Reflections
on Mr. *Whiston's* Conduct, &c.

By *WILLIAM WHISTON*, M.A.

L O N D O N :

Printed for the AUTHOR; and Sold by
A. Baldwin, near the Oxford-Arms in Warwick-
Lane. 1711. (Price 6d.)

SECOND
R. E. P. Y.

DOCTOR ALLAN



Printed for the Author and Sold by
A. S. B. (1844)

na
ha
A
fo
he
no
th
be
ow
fec
Pa
tha
he
cu
Co
ha
mo
Pro
wil
ven
on
Mi

A Second REPLY to Dr. Allix.

DR. *Allix* is obliged by the plain Force of Truth, to own so many of his former Errors and Mistakes in this his Answer, that one wou'd naturally imagine the Sense of them should have made him less willing to write again. At least one might justly expect that, after so long a time for deliberation about what he was to say, he should have taken care not to commit the like gross Mistakes in this *Answer*, which appeared in his *Remarks* before. But if the Reader will see with his own Eyes, and does not desire to be imposed upon, I will easily shew him that this Paper is worse written than the former; and that the plain Errors therein contained are here more numerous, as well as more inexcusable, than those in the other. As if by Confessing many Mistakes in the former, he had acquired a Right of committing many more in the latter Case. If I fail in my Proof of this Charge upon him, the Reader will easily retort it upon me, and I am very willing to be entirely at his Mercy upon that Account. Nay indeed, besides those Mistakes which arise from Oversight, Care-

B

lessness,

lesness, and want of Judgment, I see such shrewd Signs of some of another Nature in Dr. *Allix*, that had I not ever had a great Opinion of his Integrity hitherto, I should not be able to excuse him from the Charge of Wilfull Prevarication. Not that I at all suspect him as really dishonest, or one that allows himself in any wilful Deceit or Imposition in other Matters, or in the ordinary Affairs of Life or of Learning; but because where he thinks Orthodoxy so much concern'd, he seems not equally able to preserve an unbiass'd Degree of perfect Integrity. However, unless the Dr. can clear himself from this Suspicion of Insincerity, I declare I will have no more to say to, or do with him about these Matters; as one that am very willing to overlook humane Infirmities, but do ever rigorously expect undisguised Truth, and downright Sincerity, And that this Suspicion may be first cleared by the Dr. I shall begin with a few of those Examples which I own do shock me in this Case; and to which I must insist on a clear and direct Answer.

In the first Place then I desire him to deal plainly with me and the World, and to declare (1.) Whether he fully remembers, that in his Answer to Dr. *Payne*, he said, that there was in three Centuries no Example of Invocation to the Holy Ghost, as to *publick Prayers only*, as he now pretends. (2.) Whether he then gave the least hint that he
knew

knew he then was Invoked in private Prayers. And (3.) Whether he well remembers such a Reference to St. *Basil* as he now affirms; because I do verily believe none of these things were so. Nor indeed do I well understand his dark way of speaking towards the Conclusion of his 66th Page, if it be not a hint of his Opinion still, that the private Prayers were in this Matter the same with the Publick, and so contained no more Instances of direct Invocation to the Holy Ghost than they; however he does afterward endeavour to make the incautious Reader believe the contrary.

In the Second Place I desire to know, whether he does really believe what he says, p. 74. *I should never have done, says he, were I to gather all the Proofs that demonstrate that the Christians of the Three First Centuries constantly directed the same Prayers to the Holy Ghost, and glorified him, together with the Father and the Son.* As to the glorifying him, or using his Name in Doxologies, but in a Form diverse from those to the Father and the Son, we do not so much differ; but as to the constant Direction of the same Prayers to him, this is so diametrically contrary to what the Dr. told Dr. Payne in my hearing, that I can hardly believe him when he tells me, *He can so easily demonstrate it, and so by Consequence must be supposed firmly to believe it; especially since 'tis so evidently false, and known to be so by all*

all the Learned in these Matters. And till the Dr. gives me *one certain Example* of this Invocation, from some Author that is known to be genuine; I shall not value all his Amusements under this Article.

In the Third Place, as to that gross Mistake of 280 Days from the Conception to the Birth of our Saviour, or between Oct. 10. and April 11, or 12. the Dr. now says, p. 87. *No sure; but if Mr. W. had had a little more Equity, he ought not to have accus'd me of a Mistake, which he ought to have imputed to my Printer's Omission of some Lines in the Copy.* If there be any Sincerity in this Answer the Printer certainly omitted some Lines in the Dr's Copy. Yet is it most evident, that no such Lines were, or could be omitted by the Printer; since the whole Series of the Reasoning requires it to be as 'tis printed; and there is not the least room for Suspicion, that it could be otherwise. Hear the intire Period, and then judge :

*De Nat'ali
Christi, P.
46.*

Hæc igitur posset esse demonstratio, quæ si non diem, at saltem mensem quo Christus natus est figit. Si hebdomas quam iniit Ordo Abiæ A. Per Jul. 4550 inceptit die 10 Januarii, tum sequitur illum A. P. Jul. 4708 iniisse munus suum die 30 Martii, & finem fecisse ministerii sui 5 Aprilis; atque adeo conceptionem Joannis Baptistæ contigisse circa 7 aut 8 Aprilis A. Per. Jul. 4708. Christum verò, qui post Joannem conceptum sex mensibus conceptus fuit, conceptum fuisse, A. P. Jul. 4708. cir-

ca

ca diem 10 Octobris; & natum circa diem 11 aut 12 Aprilis, A. P. 4709. computando nimirum dies 280, ut tempus quo mulier uterum gerit. I beg that the Dr. will please to set down any Sentence which was or could be omitted by the Printer in this Case, and would clear him from the gross Error therein committed. And since, as an Intimation of some such Omission, and by way of Excuse, he refers me immediately to p. 52, where he had, he says, shew'd that some ascrib'd his Conception to the Month *Eloul*, (tho' he now owns they were mistaken; and that it ought to be *Sivan*;) Hear those Words also: *Igitur ille [Lucas] quidem indirecte & secundario supponit Johannem 1^o. anni mense, scilicet Nisan, fuisse conceptum; sed expresse Christum fuisse mense Eloul conceptum; atque adeo mense Nisan fuisse Natum.* Which Words are so far from helping out the Dr.'s Excuse, that they expressly overturn it; and shew, that there has been no such Omission at all by the Printer as he here intimates.

One thing more I desire of the Dr. under this Head of Sincerity, viz. that he will please farther to let the World know whether he was not once very near the *Arian Notions* himself, as common Fame affirms; since his perfect Silence as to that Suspicion, which I broadly hinted before, confirms me in it. And I think it may not be improper to give him this more direct Occa-

Reply.p.4.

sion

*Bull Def.
Fid. Nic.
Sec. IV. c. 3.
Sec. I. 4.*

sion of clearing that Matter. For tho' he may have altered his Opinion in this, as well as he has certainly done it very often in other Cases, yet 'tis fit, if it were really so, that the World should be acquainted, that our present Zealous Defender of Orthodoxy, the Learned Dr. *Allix*, as well as he that some time since wrote so strenuously for it, the Right Reverend Bishop *Bull*, were both once either entirely or very nearly of the other Perswasion; I mean of that which in all the latter Ages has been stiled the *Arian Heresy*.

*Answer,
p. 67.*

P. 67.~76.

But to leave this Business of Dr. *Allix's Sincerity*; which yet there will be farther occasion to call in Question by the way hereafter; I shall now come to his Arguments and Answers. He first affirms, for the Edification of the Church, that *doubtless the Primitive Christians pray'd to the Holy Ghost, as well as to the Son*; and to prove this positive Assertion he brings Examples out of the *Acts of the Martyrs*; those I suppose which *Ruinart* lately published; and would have to be genuine. The Dr. mentions in particular St. *Polycarp*, Four Martyrs under *Decius*, St. *Epipodius*, St. *Symphorianus*, the Martyrs of *Scillita*, *Perpetua* & *Felicitas*, *Theodotus* of *Ancyra*, St. *Procopius*, St. *Vincent*, St. *Euplius*, St. *Afra*, and St. *Ferreolus*; As if all these Prayed to, or praised God the Holy Ghost. I see these notable Passages in Doctor *Allix's*

lix's Answer, otherwise I should hardly have believed it possible that such poor Authorities should be alledg'd by him. For (1.) None of these Examples are to his Purpose; but St. *Epipodius*, St. *Vincent*, and St. *Euplius*; and perhaps remotely, St. *Symphorianus*, and St. *Afra*: the rest are generally against him. (2.) We have here no Examples out of Scripture, or such Antiquity as the Learned own for genuine, but only out of spurious, interpolated, or most suspected Writings. (3.) These Examples are entirely different from all the certain Monuments of those Ages whereto they pretend to belong. (4.) By such their entire difference, and that in this very Matter before us, several of them appear not to be genuine and uncorrupt; but have the proper Marks of Forgery or Interpolation upon them. (5.) Excepting the Acts of *Polycarp* in Greek, and particularly in *Eusebius*, and perhaps the Latin ones of *Perpetua* & *Felicitas*, there seem to be none sincere till near or in the fourth Century it self. Even those of *Ignatius*, which many of the Learned of late have been willing to receive as genuine, are most certainly spurious; as I shall demonstrate on a proper Occasion. So that such Examples as these, out of such very much suspected Records, contrary to all that occur in certain Authors, do rather demonstrate, that the Dr. could shew no certain Examples of this Invocation; and so he really hurts the Cause he has un-

Dissert.
in Ig-
nat. Epist.
Schol. in
calce.

- P. 67, 68. dertaken. (6.) Why does the Dr. quote this
faulty, foolish, and corrupt Paraphrase of Poly-
 carp's Acts, as Dr. Smith justly calls it, instead
 of the genuine Acts themselves, which are
 so common among us? Unless it be because
 the genuine ones, in the true Reading, are
 against the Dr. while the other seemed a lit-
 tle to favour him. If this was the real Rea-
 son, I think it another great Instance of the
 Dr's Insincerity in these Matters; for which
 he ought to make some Apology, or Ac-
 knowledgment to the World upon this Occa-
 sion. As to *Clemens Alexandrinus's* kind of Do-
 xology, *with the Holy Ghost*, it may be genu-
 ine; since we know from *Basil* that in his
 very Days, tho not earlier, some private
 Christians began to venture upon such a
 Form; tho' the Church never came into it
 till the Days of *Athanasius*; as I shall shew
 upon a proper Occasion. But, Good Rea-
 der, note here by the way a piece of In-
 sincerity many are guilty of as to this Au-
 thor: viz. That they chiefly quote *Clemens's*
Juvenile Works, written in the way of Ora-
 tory, and with less Judgment, before he
 was fully instructed by his famous Master
Pantænus; without telling the World, that
 his nobler and later Works the *Stromata* or
Miscellanies, and especially his noblest and
 latest Work, the *ὑποτυπώσεις*, or *Institutions*
 were of another Strain, and own our Savi-
 our expressly to be a *Creature*; as the Learn-
 ed very well know. But then, how the
 Dr.

Dr. can, with a good Conscience, cite *Origen*, and his truly Primitive Doxology, *in the Holy Ghost*, for the modern Practice of Invocation to him, is really amazing: When 'tis so undoubted a thing that he did not allow of any Prayer, in a proper and solemn Sense, even to the Son, but only to the Father. And I cannot but here beg thy Attention, Honest Christian Reader, while I set down two plain Passages out of this *Origen* hereto relating; that thou mayest not be imposed upon in these Matters. The *Greek* will appear elsewhere, so I shall content my self with the *English* in this place.

' We ought, says *Origen* against *Celsus*, to
' offer all Supplication, Prayer, Intercession,
' and Thanksgiving to the Supreme God, by
' that High Priest who is Superior to all
' the Angels, who is the Living Word, and
' God. We may also offer Supplication,
' Intercession, Thanksgiving, and Prayer
' to the Word himself; if we can rightly
' understand what is meant by Prayer in a
' proper, and what in an *abusive* Acceptati-
' on. But if, says the same *Origen* in his Book
' of Prayer, we understand what Prayer is,
' Care must be taken that no derivative Be-
' ing be the Object of Prayer; no not Christ
' himself; but only the God and Father of
' the Universe, to whom also our Saviour
' himself prayed, as we have before ex-
' pounded; and as he teaches us to pray.
' For when he heard one say, *Teach us to*

L. V. p.
233. See
p. 386.

Seet. 50.

' Pray, he does not teach us pray to him-
 ' self, but to his Father, saying, *Our Father*
 ' *which art in Heaven*, and the rest that fol-
 ' lows. For if, as we have elsewhere de-
 ' monstrated, the Son be different as to his
 ' Essence from the Father, and subject to
 ' him, we must either pray to the Son, and
 ' not to the Father; or to both; or to the
 ' Father alone. Now to pray to the Son,
 ' and not to the Father, every one will own
 ' to be most absurd; nay I will venture to say
 ' it will be without Effect. But if it be sup-
 ' posed that we must pray to both, and that
 ' accordingly we may offer our Petitions
 ' in the plural Number, *Do ye afford*, and
 ' *Do ye bestow Benefits*, and *Do ye grant*, and
 ' *Do ye save*, and if there be any parallel
 ' Forms to be us'd in Prayers, these do
 ' thence appear to be unlike Christian Ad-
 ' dresses. Nor can any one shew such Lan-
 ' guage in the Scripture, as spoken by any.
 ' We must say therefore, that Prayer is to
 ' be made to God alone, the Father of the
 ' Universe. &c. And these Passages are the
 ' more remarkable in *Origen*, because Bishop
 ' *Bull*, the most famous Defender of the Ni-
 ' cene Faith, owns him *exactly Orthodox* in
 ' this Doctrine of the Trinity.

Defens.
 Fid. Nic.
 Sect. II. c.
 9. Sect. 22.
 23.

P. 75.

But then, what Dr. *Allix* means by set-
 ting down the Conclusion of those Aposto-
 lical Constitutions which contain my very
 Doctrine, and are my principal Warrant in
 such Matters; especially since he had freely
 own'd

own'd in his Remarks, that *certainly it must* P. 18. 19.
be confess'd, as an unquestionable Truth, that the
Author of these Constitutions was an Arian, I do
 by no means understand. But what follows I
 own I can understand, by the help of the fore-
 going Passage ; tho' at first I was strangely
 surpriz'd at it. *I do not, says he, quote the Author* P. 75.
of the Constitutions because I believe him an
Author of the Christian Church; but because he
thought he ought to follow the Doxology that
was us'd by Christians. So that it seems *A-*
thanasius has taught him that an *Arian* Au-
 thor is not an Author of the Christian
 Church. I am not, it seems, a Christian,
 in his Opinion. Nor was Dr. *Allix* himself,
 if he ever were an *Arian*, as I suspect he
 once was, for some part of his Life a Chri-
 stian neither : But rather an *Heathen Man, or*
a Publican.

After this Dr. *Allix* comes to the first P. 76, &c.
 Verse of *Ezekiel* ; and by taking it for
 granted, that I am mistaken, and that the
 Words are in their right place already, he ve-
 ry notably proves that I am mistaken ;
 which indeed is not to be denied. But sure
 the Dr. is not in earnest when he concludes
 thus against me. If he be, I own he is
 past any Conviction that I can offer him.
 If the Doctor will but *prove* that the 30th
 Year here mentioned is that of *Ezekiel's* own
 Age, instead of *affirming* it, I will yield him
 the Point. But since *Ezekiel* ever makes
 his Dates from *Jehoiachin's* Captivity, and
 nei-

neither he nor any other Prophet, that I remember, date one Vision from any Years of their own Age, all that the Dr. says upon this Subject seems to me perfectly vain and groundless.

P. 83, 84,
85.

The Dr. is now sensible, that he made a gross mistake when he put the 595th Year before Christ, instead of the 599th for the Year of *Jehoiachin's* Captivity ; and when he thereupon affirmed the Event anticipated the Prediction in my Hypothesis four Years. This is doing me some Justice. But he soon spoils it by changing the Scene again, and supposing the 597th to be now the Year ; that so I may be sure to be condemned. Nay, that I may not escape, he supposes, contrary to all Evidence, and his former Accounts, that still the Event in my own Hypothesis will be a Year or two before the Prediction notwithstanding. But to put the Chronological Reader out of this strange Amusement, I refer him to my own Book and Tables, agreeing to *Ptolemies* Canon, for my Justification ; only hinting to him that I take *Jehoiachin's* Captivity to have happened about the end of the third *Jewish* Month ; and so leave all to his cool Thoughts and Deliberation. As to the Dr.'s gross mistake about the time of gestation in Women with Child, and particularly the *Virgin Mary*, he partly owns it, partly excuses it, and partly denies it. So that I know not what to say to him, more than what.

Chronol.
of the old
Test. p.
55, 56.

P. 87, 88.

what I have already said. Only I must declare, that I follow better Judges than the Dr. when I believe 9 Months, 40 Weeks, or 280 Days, the usual time of gestation: whereas he can chuse 7, 8, 9, or 10 Months; can make the Birth of our Saviour to have been after 6 Months of 280 Days, and of the Baptist after 9 Months of 280 Days also; can suppose numbers of Months *after Conception*, to be the numbers of Months of the *Jewish Year*, against the strongest Evidence, according as his present Exigency shall require; In short, he can evade all Sorts of Arguments and Testimonies whatsoever that are against him. Luc. I. 24.
26. 36.

The next Error that he says I take notice of in publick, is that of his counting one entire Year false in his Scheme of the Sab-
batical Years. Now in truth I never did take any publick notice of this Mistake in particular, as gross as it is. Yet since he owns it, we will pass on, and forgive it him, together with the rest; but this upon Condition, that he take better Care in Points of Chronology hereafter. P. 88, 89.

What the Dr. says about Dr. *Grabe* and *Daillee*, as to the Constitutions, is very in-considerable. Only I must observe that for want of putting *ἔτοι* for *ἔτοι*, in one Passage the Learned have supposed that the Empire was become Christian when the Constitutions were written, contrary to their whole Current, and that of this very Chapter in particular. This shews the Inaccuracy with which P. 89, 90,
91.

which these Constitutions have been hitherto treated by the Criticks; that so gross and obvious an Error of the Pen should continue still uncorrected by the Learned to this Day.

P. 91, 92,
93.

P. 91, 93.

The Dr. then says several poor things about *Arius*, *Eusebius*, *Athanasius*, and *Dionysius Alexandrinus*: And frankly owns, that he quoted *Eusebius* falsely; and falsely charged upon me one of Mr. *Mede's* Interpretations upon the Apocalypse. I forgive all these Errors; but must Ask however, Why so many instances of intolerable Carelessness and Inaccuracy all the way? Does the Dr. never read over, nor let any body else read over what he hastily writes, before it goes to Press? If I should write so, I know what ill quarter I should meet with from the World. Nor do I see that the Dr.'s much greater Age, and much greater Learning are any Privileges for him herein. I still believe that the pretended Letter of *Dionysius*, of *Alexandria* is a Forgery; that *Athanasius* had a considerable stock of Assurance; that he was in peculiar Circumstances to put such Cheats upon the Church; and that vast Numbers of the like Forgeries have obtained in and since his Days, to the great detriment of Truth and genuine Christianity. Nor am I the first or only Person that have made such Discoveries. But of all things, What does the Dr. mean when he speaks of the *Rain of Fire and Blood* in the twelfth Chapter

Chapter of the Revelation, as likely in my Opinion to denote *Heresies*; when there is not one Syllable of any *Rain of Fire and Blood* in that whole Chapter. This is really somewhat extraordinary. P. 93, 94.

But now we come to the only thing that was at all considerable in his *Remarks*; P. 94. which yet was taken out of *Daille*; why in the Dispute of the Third Century about the Re-baptization of Hereticks, the Constitutions, which are suppos'd to determine that Point in the Affirmative, were not appealed to, and did not put an end to that Controversie. What the Dr. says here by way of Answer to what I then hinted, is utterly groundless and inconsiderable. However, seeing this is the best Objection in all *Daille*, or in any Author against the same Constitutions, I shall say somewhat more to it than I did before; reserving still the full clearing of the whole Matter to my large Essay on those Constitutions. (1.) Therefore I constantly affirm, that the Constitutions, like the Baptismal Creed, were not directly quoted, as known publick Books, in that Age; tho they in general, as well as the Baptismal Creed therein contained, in particular, were esteemed the most Sacred *καταστάσις* of the Church. (2.) I observe that the Constitutions do never directly determine that Question, but only afford Foundation whence it may fairly be determined: I mean as to the Heresies then

arisen in the Church. (3.) I observe that they were appeal'd to by *Firmilian* and *Cyprian* in that manner they then usually were appeal'd to ; I mean under the Notion of *Apostolical Traditions*, of which these Constitutions were the only Sacred Repository owned in that Age. (4.) *Dionysius* of *Alexandria*, a Bishop who had a Copy of the Constitutions, was on that Side of the Question with them ; and elsewhere expressly refers to the same Constitutions also. (5.) The Church of *Rome*, which had a Copy of the Constitutions, and yet pleaded contrary Tradition as really Apostolical, had long before claimed an Authority, upon the Alteration of Circumstances, to alter the Constitutions ; nay in length of time came to look on her own latter Laws as really Authentick, if not as Apostolical ; as is most evident in the Apostolical Rule and Practice for *Easter* ; which she had laid aside soon after the beginning of the Second Century it self ; and would not let St. *Poly-carp's* own Perswasion prevail for the restoring what to his certain Knowledge was really Apostolical in that Matter. Nay, in the Days of *Eusebius*, the later Rule or Tradition was by some look'd upon as really Apostolical also. (6.) If the Church had yielded to the Constitutions, this would not have quite ended the Controversy, since the Heresies of the first Age, to which the Constitutions belonged, were not a little different

rent from some of those of the third; and so it was very hard universally to apply the same Rule to them (7.) Nay after all, if this Objection were never so valid, it would scarcely in strictness affect any more than part of one Chapter in the whole Book. Like L. VI. C. 15. as the proving 1 *John* V. 7. to be spurious, will not affect the rest of the New-Testament, nor indeed of that Epistle. So that those who from this Objection aim to overturn the Body of the Constitutions, may almost as well think to overthrow the Authority of the whole New-Testament, at least of the first Epistle of St. *John*, by overthrowing the Credit of that one Verse, which in latter Ages has been by many supposed a part of it. Tho indeed this Objection only shews, that the Church of *Rome* so early began to be Antichristian, and to set aside the Constitutions and Laws of Christ by his Apostles, for her own Traditions and Rules; and not at all that those Constitutions and Laws were not really derived from Christ by his Apostles. Nay, I heartily wish, that even the Protestant Churches did not afford us also too plain an Answer to this Objection, by at once owning the Scripture as their Rule of Faith and Practice, and yet on one pretence or other breaking many of the Laws therein contained, and that openly, from one Generation to another. But to return.

P. 94.

As to *Abiathar*, we have both refer'd the Reader to our former Books ; and so I need not add any thing farther about it in this Place. However, I cannot but note that the Dr. pretends that *Sanctius* has well reconcil'd *Saul's* two Years Reign, with the express Affirmation of *St. Paul*, confirmed by *Josephus*, that he reigned no less than forty Years : Which yet any Child of Ten Years of Age would determine to be perfectly irreconcilable : as it most certainly is, according to the common Reason of Mankind.

AA. XIII.
20, 21.
Jof. Anti.
L. VI. in
calce.

P. 94, 95.

The Doctor concludes his part with an Evasion about our Saviour's *Self-Existence* ; and hopes to excuse himself by a Scholastick Distinction from an Assertion which all the sober part of the Orthodox look on as Heretical, if not as Blasphemous. ' When, says he, we consider, that the Father has communicated his Nature to the Son, in that respect the Son can't be *αὐτοθεός*. But when we consider the Son as having the same Nature, which is eternal, we may say he is *αὐτοθεός*. The Word is not *αὐτοθεός* when we speak of him in respect of his Emanation : But when we consider him only with respect to his Nature, he is *αὐτοθεός*, as well as the Father, because his Essence is Self-existing. If *Paul*, *Clement*, *Ignatius*, or *Polycarp* would have understood this Language, I am much mistaken. However, till the Dr. can shew me this Doctrine, or Language, or Distinction in the Scri-

Scripture, or first Fathers, all this is to no manner of Purpose: for tho it sounds well, and seems to contain a fine Subtile Notion, yet till then, I and all the Impartial shall look upon it as having not the least relation to Christianity,

But now, in the conclusion, I must address my self to another unknown Person, a Friend, and if I mistake not, a very intimate Friend of the Doctor; who has a mind to answer my fifth *Plain Question*. Now that Question was this; 'By what new Revelation did the Council of *Nice* consecrate the Word *ὁμοούσιος*, when it had been directly rejected by the Council of *Antioch* so long before? In answer to which we meet with this brisk Assertion, 'That the Word *ὁμοούσιος*, even in that very Sense in which the Council of *Nice* thought fit afterward to adopt it, stands confirmed by the Authority of the Primitive Fathers before the Synod of *Antioch*. I believe and hope that this Friend of the Doctor is the Dr. himself, and that he has no Friend besides that will write so rashly in the World. For all the Learned know this is utterly and notoriously false. Unless the Meaning only be, that some bold Men had been venturing to use it a little before that time, so much as to occasion that Council to take notice of it and condemn it; which I have no intention to deny; nor will it help the Author's Cause at all. But of any other Primitive Use of

P. 96.---
115 with
p. 92.

P. 95.

of

P. 102.

P. 97. &c.

Hist. Pref.
P. 97—
109.P. 103,
&c.

of it on this Account in the Church, as distinct from the old Hereticks, I am utterly a Stranger; and so do I believe is this Author also; otherwise we should have had the Testimonies of those primitive Fathers set down, as well as this bold Assertion relating to them. For as to the great *Eusebius*, whom he afterwards quotes for this; when he had forced himself to sign that uneasy Word, and tried his utmost to justify what he had done, he could only say that *some of the Ancients* had used it before; tho without telling us who any one of those Ancients were: And this was between 60 and 70 Years after that Council. So that this weak Testimony need go no higher than is already mention'd; and will by no means justify the rash Assertion of this Author before us. As to the long Story of *Dionysius Alexandrinus*, and his pretended Letter, with a Passage about *Theognostus* produced by *Athanasius*, this Author knows I very much doubt these Records are not genuine and uncorrupt; and have given my Reasons why I do so. So I must be excus'd from any other Answer to them. The *Athanasians* must believe their Master; but for others they see too much Reason for Suspicion as to his Integrity, to believe all that he says for himself, and his own Opinions. So I pass these Matters over; and come to this Author's Account, Why the Council of *Antioch* should reject the *ὁμολογια*, when the Council of *Nice* received it? Now here

here my plain Observation and Answer is, that this whole Account, of which the Orthodox are so fond, is only taken from *Athanasius*, and his Follower *Basil*; without their so much as pretending to have original Records to justify it. So that in truth, 'tis no better than an *Athanasian* Evasion, unsupported by any sufficient Authority, but as old as the Fourth Century it self; by which the honest and unthinking part of the Church have been ever since impos'd upon to this very Day. Nor indeed does it weigh with me any farther. But here is one thing still that this Author asserts, which is invaluable, if it can be proved; viz. That the very same Council of *Antioch* which determined the Son was *not* *Consubstantial* in one Sense, did also determine he *was* *Consubstantial* in another. Here is a wonderful Discovery indeed, and such as deserves every thing the *Athanasians* can do for the Inventor: For he not only asserts it, but pretends to prove it also, from express Passages in *Athanasius* and *Basil*. Sure such an Error or Cheat, call it which you please, has not often been attempted to be put on the Christian Church before; When all the Learned World owns that both *Athanasius* and *Basil* speak in these Passages of the *Consubstantiality*, as utterly rejected by the Council of *Antioch*, but received by that of *Nice*. I shall say therefore no more upon this occasion; but only beg of the Impartial to consider

P 105.
C.c.

sider what desperate Straits a Man must be driven to when he is forced to have recourse to so insincere or most injudicious an Interpretation. Yet is there a particular Inconsistence in the Series of this Reasoning, which, in its kind, is hardly inferior to the former. I mean, that where this Author, in the beginning of the 107th Page affirms, that 'tis notorious, that *Paulus Samosatenus* acknowledg'd our Saviour to be Consubstantial with the Father in the *Sabellian* Sense of the Word; which all know takes away the difference of Persons; and yet at the end of the very same Page, and beginning of the next, he does also affirm, that the Sense wherein this *Paulus* pretended he was Consubstantial in, was, that he was a distinct *ὁσία* or *Substance* from the Father; which is directly contrary to Truth, and to the former. Yet, to do the Author Justice, in the very next Sentence almost, he owns they did pronounce that he was not *ὁμοῦσιος* in the *Sabellian* Notion of the Word, as if he would correct the foregoing Error. If all these Inconsistences belong to any body but Dr. *Allix*, I must acknowledge my self to be very much mistaken.

Thus have I a second time, tho much against my own Inclination, been prevailed upon to reply to Dr. *Allix* about these Matters. Yet do I declare, at the same time, that I shall not be easily prevailed on to write any more against him: I mean if he goes on to publish *such Remarks*, and *such Answers*

swers as these are. I being not only entirely dissatisfy'd with his way of Management, but being also very fearful of sowing my own Temper, and hurting my genuine Notions and Practice of Christianity by engaging in such trifling and uneasy Disputes, to little Purpose; and by venturing in the least degree to *draw Blood in Modern Controversy*; while my Time may be so much better spent in examining and illustrating the Sacred and most Primitive Books of our Religion; to my own, at least, if not to the publick Improvement and Edification.

To conclude the whole. 'Tis with no small Regret that I see some Men acting so strange and unchristian a Part, as to my Matters. While instead of setting themselves about Enquiry and Examination, with an honest and unbiass'd Mind, and with hearty Prayer to God for his Illumination, they rather employ all their Skill, Art, and Power *to hinder the Publication of my Books, and the producing my Evidence; to misrepresent my Person and Designs; to evade and elude the plainest Words; to inflame and embitter her Majesty and the Civil Government against me; to hinder my being heard, either by Word or by Writing; to procure a Condemnation of part of my Doctrine from the Convocation, without Examination; to betray the same Convocation into a Censure upon the Apostolical Constitutions themselves, and upon me for as-*

E serting

ferting their *Canonical Authority*, before the
 least Enquiry about them. I say before
 the *least Enquiry about them*, since the grand
 Reason assigned for such a Censure, *viz.* that
they are never reckoned as of that Authority by
any General Council, is so contrary to the
 Truth of that Case; for there is hardly one
 General Council but has quoted them as An-
 cient, Sacred, and Apostolical: Nor one,
 that I remember, till very late Ages, but
 in its References to, and Confirmations of
 the *Canonical Books*, does either directly as-
 sert, or most plainly imply that these are
 really *Canonical*; as shall be shewn in my
Essay upon them: To misrepresent my Friends
 and Assistants, as *Socinians* at least, if not
 Deists, or Atheists; to raise or spread idle
 ill-grounded Stories about my private Af-
 fairs and Management; to provoke me by
 hard Usage, and the denial of the common
 Rights of Mankind, and then to take Ad-
 vantage of any unguarded Expression, or
 less complying Deportment, which the Ve-
 hementness of my Temper, and Firmness of
 my Resolution in so good a Cause betray
 me to; to put the worst Construction on
 every thing; to spread idle false Stories,
 that I am supported by Deists or Atheists;
 to divert me from my main Designs, by pub-
 lishing weak, ill-grounded, and injudicious
 Pamphlets, such as are those of Mr. *Mat-
 tair*, and another without a Name, just
 publish'd, entitl'd, *Reflections on my Conduct*;
 and

and while the truly Learned must know that they cannot properly and thoroughly Answer me; (nay, while the Convocation has almost publickly yielded and asserted one of my principal Articles, I mean, that the Son is *Subordinate* to the Father); to bear the World in Hand, that this and the other Person of Reputation is to write against me; and commonly such as either are known not to be capable, or have never perused the Papers they are to answer; and after all, to affright me with Legal Penalties, and to deter me by the Fears of Excommunication and Imprisonment. These are the Methods of late made use of against me by the Enemies of *my Designs*; I must not say by the Enemies of *Truth and Christianity* among us. Tho' since I am sure I have no Designs but what are for the real Interest of both those most desirable things; and am willing to take all proper Methods, and make use of all proper Helps for the Discovery of the same; no one, I am certain, can really be an Enemy to my Designs, but he must so far (tho' perhaps by mistake and unwittingly) be at the same time an Enemy to *Truth and Christianity* also. But as for those who think to affright me from my Duty, and to hinder the Publication of my Papers, by Worldly Motives and Terrors, I do humbly hope that, as through the Goodness of God such Procedure has not in the least shaken my honest Resolutions hitherto,

So neither will it be able to shake them hereafter. And for the Effect of any Legal Prosecution as to my *Designs*, whatever it may be as to my *Person* and *Family*, which yet are both under the Protection of the good Providence of God, I do verily believe my Arguments will not be weaker, nor their Force less upon the honest part of Mankind, tho I should be obliged to date any or all of my Books hereafter from a Place of Confinement. Nay, perhaps this may not be disagreeable to the Methods of Divine Providence, that as no small part of the Original Doctrines and Books of our holy Religion were first preached and written in Bonds, or under Persecution, so this Attempt for the Revival of the same Christianity must meet with the like Treatment before it be received by the Church. And if so, may I ever be truly disposed to say, *The Will of the Lord be done.*

June 23.
1711.

WILL. WHISTON.

P O S T

POSTSCRIPT.

JUST at the going of this to the Press, I received the Learned Mr. Chishul's Visitation Sermon, entituled, *The Orthodoxy of an English Clergy-Man*: Which has some Relation to me. For therein he has these Words, 'Two Alarms are now given to the Church of *England* by two very considerable Men. The one --- The other a very Learned Divine; who, glorying in the Character of *Arian*, has openly renounced the Doctrine of the blessed Trinity. If Mr. Chishul had said that, 'The other having, as he fully believes, discovered the Original Christian Faith to be that which has long been call'd *Arian*, he owns himself of the same Faith, notwithstanding that Name is affixed to it: And that finding also, as he is thoroughly perswaded, the usual Explication of the Doctrines concerning the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost, and the calling them *One Doctrine of the Trinity*, to be no other than the *Athanasian* Heresy, he rejects the same, and keeps to the Original Simplicity of the Gospel: He had much better express'd my Sentiments. But not to dispute this with him, what I mainly find fault with in his Sermon, which is the great, the common, the fatal Mistake of all National and Established Churches, and of their Defenders, is the taking disputable things for granted, without Examination; and indeed, a secret and concealed Preference to

Infallibility.

Infallibility. So that while Men suppose beforehand that their own Doctrines, Articles, Creeds, and Rules are every one true and right, all Attempts for any Amendments, be they never so honest, and on Grounds never so just and necessary, are of course rejected; and the Proposer stigmatiz'd, and fought against as a common Enemy. Yet what harm, I pray, am I doing the Christian Church, by begging leave to lay before her 1200 or 1300 Texts of Scripture, and Testimonies of the earliest Writers for her Consideration? Or by offering to her some Original Sacred Books of her own holy Religion long since lost or disus'd? Such indeed as will, when receiv'd and followed, put an end to almost all her Disputes, and will make her a *Praise in the whole Earth*. What imaginable Foundation is there in this Case for any Church or Convocation to be angry with me? Nay, how can any that call themselves Christians, do otherwise than consider what I have to offer, coolly and fairly; endeavour to separate all the Mistakes from the rest; and receive so much of it as, upon the most Impartial Enquiry, shall appear true and genuine; and after all, bless God for any new Light, and set about all the necessary Amendments immediately. This is the common Voice of Nature, Reason, and Conscience, in such a Case; but is quite overborn by this latent Notion of the *Churches Infallibility*. This Reflection brings to my mind the Purport of one part of a Sermon I once heard at *St. Paul's*; which when put out of that more artful Turn the Preacher gave it, was, methought, to this Effect. 'The Church of *Rome* is a very Wicked, Tyrannical Church: She will not let Men have the Scriptures, nor search for Truth in them; and so is utterly unjustifiable. But the Church of *England*

' *England* is an excellent unexceptionable
 ' Church: She gives you Bibles, and the Pri-
 ' mitive Fathers, and liberty to examine, nay
 ' charges you to search the Scriptures throug-
 ' ly; as also to read the Fathers very carefully;
 ' and expects it at your Hand to take nothing
 ' upon trust, nor by impieite Faith. Provi-
 ' ded still, that, for the Prevention of Errors
 ' and Heresies, you observe all along, that her
 ' Doctrine, Worship, and Discipline are cer-
 ' tainly most true, pure, and primitive; and
 ' that he can never be a true Son of the Church
 ' who does not own it, after he has examined:
 ' Since he thereby will and *must* find that every
 ' thing therein is most exactly according to the
 ' Appointment of Christ and his Apostles. And
 ' truly Mr. *Chishul* seems to me in the present Ser-
 ' mon to be of this Preacher's Mind, and in a
 ' silent way to suppose our Churches Infallibility:
 ' Especially he is not able to conceal this Opini-
 ' on, when he so commends that Statute of a cer-
 ' tain College in *Oxford*, which, it seems, obli-
 ' ges its Members, under an Oath, to repeat the
 ' Collect for *Trinity-Sunday*, and so to pray for
 ' Perseverance in the *Athanasian* Doctrine, every
 ' Morning and Evening of their whole Lives.
 ' When I read such an amazing Passage, and com-
 ' pare it with the common Notions in my own
 ' Mind, and the Commands in Scripture, as to
 ' the Obligation we are all under to search for and
 ' follow Christ and his Apostles, and to reject
 ' whatsoever is contrary to them, by what Men,
 ' or Church, or even Angel soever it be taught;
 ' I cannot but be out of Measure surpriz'd, and
 ' wonder at the Power of Custom and long Set-
 ' tlements over the Minds of Men. Since other-
 ' wise the very Thought of such a thing would
 ' shock an honest Enquirer: as it would a Papist
 ' begin-

beginning to see the Errors of Popery, to be engaged by Oath to use a like Prayer for the Continuance of his Belief of Purgatory and Transubstantiation every Morning and Evening of his whole Life. But Mr. Chishul's Sermon not entering into the Merits of my Cause in particular, does not require any more direct Consideration. However, in requital for the Collect he mentions, I will venture to recommend two others to him, and to every good Christian, as more proper for their daily Devotions: the one from the Apostolical Constitutions; and the other from our own Liturgy.

Constit.
L. VII.
C. 45.

Ὁ Θεός, ὁ παντοκράτωρ, ὁ πᾶσι τῷ Χριστῷ σου, τῷ μονογενῆς υἱῷ σου; δός μοι σῶμα ἄσπιλον, καρδίαν καθάρην, νῦν γρηγορεῖν, γινώσκιν ἀπλανῆ, πνέματι ἁγίῳ ἐκφοίτησιν, πρὸς κτήσιν καὶ πληροφροσίαν τῆς ἀληθείας διὰ τοῦ Χριστοῦ σου. δι' ᾧ σοι δόξα, ἐν ἁγίῳ πνεύματι, εἰς τὰς αἰῶνας. Ἀμήν.

In English thus:

Almighty God, the Father of thy Christ, thine only begotten Son; Grant to me a Body undefil'd, an Heart pure, a Mind watchful; with the sure Knowledge of thee, and the Assistance of thy Holy Spirit; that I may fully understand and be establish'd in thy Truth; through thy Christ; By whom Glory be to Thee, in the Holy Spirit, for ever. Amen.

Collect
for Sim.
& Jude.

O Almighty God, who hast built thy Church upon the Foundation of the Apostles and Prophets, Jesus Christ himself being the Head Corner-Stone; Grant us so to be joined together in Unity of Spirit by their Doctrine, that we may be made an Holy Temple, acceptable unto thee, through Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.

FINIS.

A

Second Postscript.

SINCE I have this fair Opportunity of another Postscript, I shall here say somewhat to a nameless Pamphlet just Publish'd, which I have already mention'd, and which is stil'd *Reflections on my Conduct*; tho' it seems to aim rather at the Destroying my Reputation, than the Answering my Arguments. And I wonder the more at this, because, if I be not misinform'd, it comes from one that has long known me, and that, till very lately, has always freely own'd me as honest and sincere also. I shall make no Reprisals, but only shew, as I go over it in order, with how very little Foundation of Knowledge, or Judgment, this Pamphlet is written. And to wave most of this Author's hard Words, and unchristian Expressions; which I freely forgive him, and which he knows prove nothing at all; I shall rather confine my self to his Facts and Arguments. He affirms soon after the beginning, that I *Defy'd the Convocation under the invidious Compliment of a Dedication*. I am sure I meant no Defiance, but a free and earnest Appeal to them, and the Christian Church; and as a real Respect to this Church, and her Convocation; that so the Clergy might have opportunity for the Examination and Correction of my Papers before they were Publish'd to all the World.

Pag. 4.

Ibid. &c.

He then is to prove me guilty of want of Modesty, from my declaring my Opinions with Assurance, upon a very small Acquaintance with Ecclesiastical Antiquity. Now as to this, I gave the Reader only a History of Facts, without the least boasting or assuming. And since it is true, that between *Feb. 1708*, and *July* the same Year, I had searched the two First Centuries, and written for the main that Account of the Primitive Faith, which I soon communicated to the Governors of the Church, and the Learned; sure it was not offensive to say so. And I hope it will not be an *unanswerable* Argument against the Evidence which I there produce, that I was so diligent and successful in my Enquiries about those matters. Tho' indeed there is a peculiar Reason why I, or any other Man, that is not to make the Ancients speak what we please, but only to give a true Account what they really do say, may quickly go through such a Work; because the first obvious Sense of Words is to be then generally taken: Whereas those who read them for the Confirmation or Confutation of particular Opinions and Schemes, as the Generality do, must have a long time, and use many helps and contrivances in order to pervert them; which I take to be the true Reason that so much time is usually thought necessary for the understanding those Primitive Fathers in these matters. *Tertullian* was an Heretick, and later than the Authors I mainly insisted on; and so he needed not be all so exactly read and understood, as was necessary in the earlier and truly Catholick Writers. Yet do I venture to say, that I read the proper Parts of him several times in the same Interval; and I think well understood his Opinions, so far as they were to be understood. Tho' indeed those his Opinions prov'd
fre-

frequently to be of little Authority, and unsupported by all the Contemporary Catholick Writers. This is own'd in all other Cases but that before us; where the want of better Authority makes the Orthodox willing to dissemble his other disagreeable Notions, and to vouch him for a Man of great Consideration, tho' it be only in some of these Matters. As to *Ignatius's* larger Epistles, 'tis obvious they are very ancient, and that on a very small Perusal; and I venture to say, my last Enquiries as to them, the Result of which is not yet publish'd, will certainly shew that I was not then mistaken. This is a very pleasant way of answering Arguments, to pretend they were too suddenly found, and too readily discover'd. If this Author can prove that these Epistles are late and spurious, I shall not quarrel about the time, in how long or how short a Space that Proof is made. And there is room for his Diligence here, because my small imperfect Essay upon them still remains unanswered. Some of the Learned have indeed been examining into that matter; but their Labours have been with too little success to be thought worthy of the Publick hitherto. Dr. *Grabe* has, I believe, one MS. in his Hand, which a Learned Foreigner, its Author, did me the Favour to shew me; and He is hereby invited, if he thinks good, as I am told he has leave, to publish it to the World for my Confutation in that matter. But when this Author affirms that I say, *Ibid.*

“ My Evidence for the Sacred Authority of the
 “ Apostolical Constitutions, on a *little* Enquiry,
 “ became most unquestionable, He grossly imposes on his Reader. That Passage belongs plainly to my last additional Evidence, by the discovery of the Apostles own Testimony at *Oxford*, in the Preface to their *Διδασκαλία*, after I had fully satisfied

my self long before about them; and not to my using in general *little* Enquiry in that matter. And I assure this Author, that I have not made *little*, but *very great* and careful Enquiry about that Book, and its Authority; as he will see when my Papers are publish'd; to the utter Silencing of all those vain Surmises and Reproaches which such as he, venture, without examination, to cast out concerning what I still esteem the *most Sacred of the Canonical Books of the New Testament*. If he has any real Arguments, that are not commonly known, to prove either that, or the *Διδαχὴ*, not to be genuine, let him produce them; Otherwise let him not think such random Censures, and unskilful Reflections on me about them, will overturn those strong and convincing Arguments I have for them.

Pag. 7.

This Author aims also at a Reflection or two at my *New Theory*: But seems never to have seen the Second Edition of it, nor indeed to have any farther knowledge of the Work it self, than what is sufficient for his present Purpose; I mean to expose and ridicule it as he goes along. Those who are really Masters of that Book, will not heed such Trifles: and for the rest, they are not capable of receiving farther satisfaction.

P. 8, &c.

After this our Author exceedingly Flourishes on behalf of the Council of *Nice*, and wonders I do not take it into my *Primitive Antiquity*. Now I thought this had not been my singular Case, but that Bishop *Bull*, Dr. *Grabe*. Mr. *Dodwell*, &c. had been of the very same Mind, that the *Antenicene* Fathers only are the best Guides, next the Sacred Writings. And indeed I take the Reason to be very plain, that they are here to be alone valued; because our grand Question is, Whether the Councils, even the General Councils of the Church, when they came to meddle

meddle with, and model the Christian Faith and Practice, did keep exactly to the Ancient Christian Faith and Practice, or not? However, This Author ought not to enlarge so much on the vast Opportunities and Authority of the Council of *Nice* in particular, as even sufficient to set aside the ancienter Testimonies of single Writers, when he cannot but know that the much ancienter Council of *Antioch*; and the three very little later Councils of *Tyre*, *Jerusalem*, and *Constantinople*; the Second of which last three was more numerous than that of *Nice*, and but 10 Years after it; nay, all three in the same Reign of *Constantine* also, were directly against its Determinations in these Matters. Sure these four Councils for the *Arians* will be able to balance the single Authority of the major part of one; especially when the Partiality, the Heats, and Hast were therein so notorious; and when, if *Monfaucon* says true, that doubtful Creed it establish'd, was done with so little Deliberation, that it was sign'd the very same Day that the Council met; as the Reader may observe in that Learned Author's Life of *Athanasius*. Which is a Circumstance highly worthy the honest Enquirer's Reflection upon this Occasion.

Then our Author proceeds to prove, that I am *P. 12, C. 2* one of the Heretical *Arians*, or the Followers of *Arius* himself; nay, that I am an *Eunomian*, or most compleat *Arian*. Pray, Sir, what is all this to the Purpose? Do not I own my self a Christian, even in those very Points that have been long call'd the *Arian*, or the *Eunomian* Heresy? And own, that I agree with the Body of the *Eusebians*, or *Arians* of the Fourth Century? Only, that with them I disapprove and condemn the Rashness of *Arius* himself, and his peculiar Followers,

Followers, where they ventur'd on New and Unscriptural Doctrines or Expressions; as I do in the very same Manner disapprove of, and condemn such New and Unscriptural Doctrines or Expressions of the Council of *Nice* it self; and that in both Cases, without being fully satisfied that all those Doctrines and Expressions are directly false and indefensible. I do not think, that any private Suspicion or Conjecture of any Council, or of any Man, which may possibly be true, is therefore, without Divine Revelation, to become an Article of Faith immediately: Nor, if I were ever so confident in the way of Hypothesis, that any of those unsupported Doctrines or Expressions on either Side were not false, would I venture to put them into Propositions, or Creeds, or Articles, containing the *Primitive Faith of Christians*: Tho' indeed I wou'd not reject any from the Churches Communion, for privately and modestly declaring their Thoughts concerning them: Which was the very Case of the Body of the Christians or *Arians* in the former Part of the Fourth Century, when this Matter came first before the Christian World; whose Procedure therefore I cannot but highly commend in this Matter.

P. 17, &c.
& 25, 26.

What this Author says next about the Constitutions, excepting so much as is taken from Dr. *Allix*, and has been already consider'd, is of no Consequence at all: Nor do I depend upon bare Guesses for the Correction of some of the Original Doxologies therein contained, as he afterwards supposes, without the least Authority for such a Supposition. I believe, he will not pretend to have himself made any Discoveries about that Book. So I shall leave that Matter, till my Essay on those Constitutions is made publick. And if all our late Writers had done so too, it would

would at last, I believe, have been as well for their own Reputation. But some Men must be confusing what they think an Unorthodox Opinion, even when they are conscious to themselves, that they do not at all know what are those Arguments against which they are to direct their Confutation.

As to what this Author insinuates, that in the Progress of my Enquiries I have not always been of the same Mind, 'tis most certainly true. And since I gave the World a faithful Account, by what Steps I came gradually into the several Opinions I am now of in these Matters, it was plainly unavoidable. I did not desert any of the vulgar Notions till Enquiry and Evidence forced me. And this Author, who thinks it incredible I should read over, and understand the most Primitive Writers in a few Months, will not grudge me sure a Year or Two to discover all the Original Evidence, and to search all the Chronology belonging to these Constitutions. But this he ought to know, that I have for a good while finish'd my last Enquiries about them; and that I have for a good while fix'd my last Opinion concerning them, without any Variation: I mean only until the Enquiries of others shall produce any new Evidence. For whatever Assurance I have of their most Sacred Authority, according to the Evidence that lies before me, I shall, I hope, ever keep one Ear open for the Admission of any farther Testimonies, or Arguments, which the Learned may hereafter discover: Which is no other than is to be done in the Case of the known Canonical Books; nay, in all other Cases whatsoever.

But then what this Author affirms, that I have *mangled a great Part of St. Matthew's Gospel*; and intimates, that my Lord Bishop of Worcester has

P. 23, 24,
27, 28.

P. 24.

has *chastis'd* me on that Account, is very unfair, and utterly groundless. What I have said on that Occasion has never yet been answered: Nor did that most Learned Prelate, that I remember, ever reckon my Observation and Restoration of those Dislocations, as any Crime in me. Nay indeed, my Knowledge of his Lordship's own clear Opinion, that there are several the like Dislocations in the present Copies of the Bible elsewhere, did in part embolden me here to assert, what seem'd at once so strange, and yet so evident, concerning those Dislocations. And if he pleases to study the Harmony of the Gospels with due Care, he will, I believe, soon find himself at a loss, without the Observation of those Dislocations. However, I cannot but think of the Ingenious Observation of a very late Author, *Divines are bred to believe; Philosophers to examine. Believers hate Examiners; and Examiners hate Believers.* Now in this Case, several Authors of late seem to be Divines, by believing only, and hating those that examine; as well as others seem to be Philosophers, by examining only, and hating those that believe; tho' for my self, I cannot be properly rank'd under either of those Denominations. For I own my self a firm Believer, but then it is upon a thorough Examination; and further I care not to go in any Matters whatsoever. And when our Author has been an Examiner for some Time, he will certainly have a better Opinion of some of the Consequences of my Examination. I shall pass over now this Author's solemn Opinion about 1 *John* v. 7. and his Recommendations of Dr. *Mills's Excellent Dissertation* for its Vindication; because I believe this Author has not *examined*, but *believed* all the precarious Hypotheses and Mistakes therein contained; and

Religion
& Morals,
P. III.

P. 26.

and because that Dissertation, when freed from those Hypotheses and Mistakes, is it self abundantly sufficient to destroy its Authority with all Men of Judgment and Impartiality.

I shall now come to the grand Chronological Error that he has found, and which he aggravates accordingly; viz. That in the very same *Advice for the Study of Divinity*, nay, within three or four Pages in it, I directly contradict my self, by placing the Apostolical Canons at the End of the Second, or the Beginning of the Third Century; and yet asserting, that the Apocalypse, written A. D. 96. was yet written after the 8th of those Canons. This Charge I ought not to be uneasy at; and no one that compares things as they barely lie before him there, but must readily suppose, that I truly am guilty of a gross Contradiction. Yet is it not so in Reality; because I knew from certain Characters in that 8th Canon, that it was made by the Apostles themselves, before the Writing the Apocalypse, as among other things the Attestation, by *me Clement* demonstrated; and this a great while before I discovered that the rest of those Canons were made at the same time. Nay indeed, I take my Knowledge thereof to have been one of my grand Motives to search that Matter anew; and to enquire whether, notwithstanding the contrary Opinions of the Learned; the rest of the same Canons were not also Apostolical: As I afterward found them really to be.

But now this Author makes a loud Complaint, that I have publish'd private Conversation, and printed private Letters without Leave, and yet suppress'd others, as I thought convenient. I cannot say I have done *nothing* of all this, because one or two Famous Passages, which by

p. 27.

p. 296.
299.

p. 29.

often Repetition in private, were almost become publick, I did insert into my *Historical Preface*; tho' where it was necessary it was done without the Insertion of any Names. I did also, I own, venture to publish Part of my Lord Bishop of *Norwich's* Letter, which must be inoffensive to every body, without asking leave for so doing; tho' I never understood his Lordship was in the least displeas'd on that Account. But of all this whole Charge, these Instances are all that I remember to be true; unless the necessary Vindication of my self from Mr. *Wilkins's* Misrepresentation of Dr. *Grabe's* Discourse with me, be, without all Reason, laid under any such Imputation. For the Reader may easily see by my *Historical Preface*, that I inform'd both the Archbishops of my Intention to publish their Grace's Letters: which yet the least Intimation of their Unwillingness should have prevented. Those of my Lord Bishop of *Worcester* were printed, not only by his Consent, but Direction. Those of Dr. *Bradford* were also published with his Consent, tho' two of them, whose Answers I had not preserv'd, or lost, could not then be inserted: which yet will, without fail, appear in the next Edition: since he has now given me Copies of my Answers to go along with them. Nor shall I at all value his Intimation, that Dr. *Grabe's* Account of the foremention'd Conference contradicts mine, till I see it under Dr. *Grabe's* Hand. He is too honest a Man to say so: and if he remembers any Circumstances omitted by me, I suppose I shall be easily able to recollect them also, without any Suspicion that either of us in the least wilfully departed from the Rules of Truth and Honesty in that Matter.

This

This Author has next a Story from Hear-say, that three or four Years ago I was as vehement against *Athanasius*, and the Council of *Nice*, and for *Arianism* as now, after my longer Examination. If he will keep to three Years, it may be true : because I was then satisfy'd as to the ancient Faith in this matter, upon a full Examination. If he goes much farther, 'tis utterly false ; and he can have no good Authority for such a Relation.

He also has been inform'd, that I have dar'd to deny that there are any Expressions in Scripture that ascribe Eternity to God the Father. Now I shall here freely own to him, that I believe the usual Language of Scripture, *ἐν αἰῶνι* & *εἰς αἰῶνα*, or *μετὰ χρόνον αἰώνιον*, and *εἰς τὸ αἰῶνας* & *ἕως αἰώνων*, with the like, does certainly not imply a Scholastick Eternity, either *à parte ante*, or *à parte post* ; but does properly denote, from the beginning of this World, and through all its grand Ages and Periods, till their final Conclusion, and no more : And when he speaks as if he believed otherwise, he betrays his great Ignorance in that Sacred and Primitive Dialect, and that he has taken his Notions of such words from Writers of Controversy only. Tho', I confess, there will be no great harm in extending them farther in the Case of the Supreme God, because we otherwise know that he is absolutely Eternal in a still higher Acceptation. As to what Report he has heard about my slighting some Citations out of the smaller Epistles of *Ignatius*, as quoted by some later Writers, I do not well remember the Conversation he refers to ; nor do I fully understand his meaning. Only I shall inform him, that if he pleases to stay till my Dissertation on those Epistles is published, he will

see I have not the least occasion for any disingenuous Arts there; and that the Quotations, made out of those Smaller Epistles, till the Middle of the Fifth Century, are comparatively to those of the larger, but few, highly to be suspected, and of little consideration. If I am not able to determine that Dispute, I will not often pretend to do it in any parallel Case whatsoever.

P. 31, 32,
33. Towards the Conclusion, our Author is very angry with me for sending a Letter to the Convocation by Mr. Emlin, the famous Socinian Preacher, formerly condemn'd for Blasphemy in Ireland: And he says therein, *I am also endeavouring to propagate Blasphemy.* Good Sir, Truth and Soft Words upon this Occasion! Mr. Emlin, I assure you; to my knowledge, is no Socinian; nor do I believe that he ever was one: And when from common Fame, that known Lyar, you assert so great an Untruth, and upon that Untruth the more securely impute Blasphemy to him; take notice, that you must give an Account of such your Calumny at the Great Day. Mr. Emlin's Christian Truth, here stil'd Blasphemy, for which he was condemn'd in Ireland 8 Years ago, was not very much more than what our Convocation this Year have approv'd of as Orthodox: I mean the Asserting that *Inequality* of the Son to the Father; which under the more plausible term of *Subordination*, is now becoming the Doctrine of this Church. Of which, more in that Account of the Convocation, which I am about to publish.

As to all the rest of this Author's random Imputations and Reflections on Books or Assertions of mine, they are too weak, and arise from too passionate and disorder'd a Temper, and are too unsupported by all Evidence, to be worthy of any farther Reflections. And so I take my leave, and wish him seriously to consider what he writes here-

hereafter ; and not by endeavouring by ill Arts and idle Stories to take away other Men's Reputation, to run too great a Risk of forfeiting his own. And I beg of him to consider well what will be his Crime another Day, if, after all his Zeal and Heat for Orthodoxy, he should at last prove to be mistaken : If the Doctrines he calls Blasphemous should prove to be the Sacred Truths of *Christ Jesus* ; if the Constitutions and Doctrine of the Apostles, he so despises, should prove to be genuine ; and if those whom he vilifies with all the Names of Scorn and Reproach possible should be in the right, and should be intended, in some degree, for Instruments in God's Hand to revive the Primitive Faith and Piety among us. I conclude with the two last Verses of one of the Lessons for this Day, which all we that deal in Controversy had need never to forget : *Let all Bitterness, and Wrath, and Anger, Eph. iv. and Clamour, and Evil-speaking be put away from 31, 32. you, with all Malice. And be ye kind one to another, tender-hearted, forgiving one another, even as we hope God for Christ's sake will forgive us.*

June 27. 1711.

Will. Whiston.

F I N I S.

himself; and not by endeavouring to be
 and idle stories to take away other Men's Re-
 name, to set too great a Link of fortitude his
 own. And I beg of him to consider well what
 will be his Charge another Day, after all his
 Good and Heart for Orthodoxy, he should at last
 prove to be mistaken: he the Doctor, he the
 Pious, he the good, should prove to be the great
 Plurality of Cases; if the Confession and
 Doctrine of the Apostles, he is doubtful, should
 prove to be genuine; and if those whom he vi-
 sited with all the Names of Zeal and Repen-
 tance should be in the right, and should be in-
 tended, in some degree, for Instruments in God's
 Hand to revive the Primitive Faith and Piety
 among us. I conclude with the two last Verses
 of one of the Lessons for this Day, which all
 we that live in Conscience had need never to
 forget: Let us have Grace, and Mercy, and
 and Clasp, and Faith, and be put away from
 you, with all a Sinner. And be ye kind one to another,
 tender-hearted, forgiving one another, even as we hope
 God will forgive us.



Will. Whiston.

June 27. 1720.

